

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/656,900	AXINTE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen J. Ralis	3742	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Stephen J. Ralis.

(3) James Denaro.

(2) Stephanie Willett.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 May 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 69.


Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Tu Ba Hoang
Primary Examiner

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner and applicant discussed claim 69 in light that claims 1-68 will be potentially canceled. Applicant discussed the limitation of the switching mechanism relative to the illumination source and the dual electrode heating tip. Applicant noted some potential locations in the Specification that disclosed a limitation in which the illumination source is powered independently of the heating element and directed the examiner to Figure 5 of the application. The examiner noted that Figure 5 discloses the illumination source and the heated tip as being parallel configured to allow for independent control of the heating tip with respect to the illumination source and that this is an important distinction.

The examiner further noted that any limitations that have not been previously presented and would require further consideration and/or a new search.

 5/18/07